

## REMARKS

The new claim and the amendments to the claims do not add new matter. They are consistent with the original specification and drawings.

Claims 1, 8, 10-13, 15 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bosco et al (5852395).

The Bosco et al patent does not disclose or suggest a Rogowski coil having a single homogeneous wire that forms both the coil and the central conductor. Bosco et al merely states what is known prior to their invention and Applicant's invention. Bosco et al specifically states that the central conductor and the Rogowski coil are not the same homogeneous wire. This is clear when Bosco states in Column 2 lines 24-25 "The current flowing in this conductor is measured by the aid of the Rogowski coil 1." Bosco et al does not disclose, suggest or contemplate the Rogowski coil of the present invention.

Bosco et al does not disclose the subject matter of claims 8, 10-13, 15 and 23-25 which are all dependent on having a single homogeneous wire that forms both the coil and the central conductor.

Therefore claims 1, 8, 10-13, 15 and 23-25 having a single homogeneous wire that forms both the coil and the central conductor are not anticipated by Bosco et al and neither are they obvious or predictable by Bosco et al. Thus it is requested that the rejection of claims 1, 8, 10-13, 15 and 23-25 35 USC 102(b) be withdrawn and that these and claim 32 be allowed.

Claim 2-7, 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosco et al (5852395) in view of Ishii et al (EP 1394818A1).

Ishii does teach insulating transformer wires but does not teach insulating wires that are used to form a Rogowski coil and especially a Rogowski coil having single homogeneous insulated wire that forms both the coil and the central conductor. Neither does Bosco teach this. Therefore it is submitted that Claims 2-7, 9 and 14 and new claim 32 are not obvious or predictable by Bosco et al in view of Ishii et al for the reasons set forth above and therefore it is requested that these claims be allowed.

Claims 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bosco et al in view of Kato (6885183).

Claims 16-22 are all dependent on claim 1 and thus all have an insulated single homogeneous wire that forms both the coil and the central conductor. Neither Bosco et al or Kato disclose, suggest or contemplate this. Therefore it is submitted that Claims 16-22 and new claim 32 are not anticipated, obvious or predictable by Bosco et al in view of Kato for the reasons set forth above and therefore it is requested that these claims be allowed.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is requested.

Dated: April 12, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

James B. Conte  
Registration No.: 54,661  
Phone (312) 655-1500  
Facsimile (312) 655-1501  
e-mail:  
james.conte@huschblackwell.com